THEOLOGY

VOL. LVII SEPTEMBER, 1954 No. 411

Editorial

EVERYONE acquainted with the history of the Church of England in the nineteenth century has heard of "Henry of Exeter", but until now this remarkable prelate has been without a proper biography. During his lifetime an attempt was indeed made to produce one but, being dissatisfied with the first volume, Phillpotts characteristically took legal action to prevent the further prosecution of the undertaking. Now, over eighty years after his death, Dr G. C. B. Davies and the Church Historical Society are to be congratulated on the publication of a book that makes generous reparation. *Henry Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter, 1778–1869* (S.P.C.K., 42s.) is, in the first place, a thoroughly enjoyable ecclesiastical biography. Phillpotts was a very strong and colourful personality; his career was full of incident and excitement; and to read about him and his doings is like being transported into Trollope's Barsetshire. It is true that one would like to know more than can now be discovered about the bishop's personal habits and his domestic life; his wife and eighteen children are shadowy figures, and for several years, while he was Bishop of Exeter, there is apparently no evidence to show even where he resided.

On the other hand, Dr Davies has had at his disposal a great deal of MS material which, together with Phillpotts's numerous publications, has made it possible to create a faithful and more or less continuous picture of his public life and his official activities. This volume is therefore more than a biography. The ample and judicious use made of both MS and rare printed material constitutes it an historical source book of notable value for both ecclesiastical and political affairs from about 1820 to 1870. Phillpotts, from early in his career, was in close relations with leading figures in Church and State, and there are here many previously unpublished letters from Wellington, Peel, and Gladstone, as well as from Pusey, Manning, Keble, and others. All his life he had an insatiable appetite for polemics, and there were few of the controversies of the age in which he did not intervene. He was as formidable in the House of Lords as in his diocese. While the new matter here published goes to confirm what was already known, it will be found in certain particulars to throw fresh or fuller light on the character or views of Phillpotts's correspondents. His acute powers of observation make his letters and publications a repository of lively information about contemporary manners and morals. We cannot help lamenting that he kept no journal.

The generally accepted impression of Phillpotts himself as a "mitred termagent" appears to be broadly correct. It is impossible altogether to approve of his pugnacity, and his love of litigation is its

least attractive feature, yet his presence on the episcopal bench had a bracing effect on the Church of England in his time and as a diocesan bishop he certainly did much more good than harm. His courage and indifference to popularity are especially admirable. He is no doubt rightly described as a "pre-Tractarian High Churchman", a type that deserves to be better known. But Phillpotts was so highly individual that he does not fit comfortably into any classification. Dr Davies says that "to extreme doctrinal rigidity he added a marked aversion to all but the most conservative reforms" (p. 398), but the narrative shows that Phillpotts combined with his High Toryism many of the dispositions of a reformer, not least in his own diocese where he initiated important improvements which are now commonplace but were startling novelties then. In fact, just as he bridges the periods before and after the Reform Act, so he was not only behind but also ahead of his times. Credit, which is usually assigned to Samuel Wilberforce, for some aspects of the Victorian church revival belongs at least equally to Henry Phillpotts.

Dr Davies devotes a chapter to the Gorham case, which does not of course deal with the subject in so much detail as Mr Nias did in his *Gorham and the Bishop of Exeter*, but which provides some interesting additional material. Dr Davies agrees with Mr Nias in thinking that the Gorham controversy has little help to offer to the modern student of the doctrine of baptism, and it must be confessed that other fiercely contested ecclesiastical battles of a century ago seem now to have been battles in a fog. One of the lessons which the study of church history constantly suggests is that some present controversies may eventually be seen to partake of that character.[1]

Woman and the Church's Lay Ministry[2]

THE ministry of women can be considered in terms of justice, expediency, and common sense; or in terms of theology. When he presented[3] to the Church Assembly the 1952 Report of the Central

[1] Dr Davies's comments on the various episodes and controversies, which are encountered in the course of his narrative, are useful and just, though not always so clearly expressed as could be wished. We have noticed some mistakes in regard to matters of detail, apart from some obvious printing slips. P. 9, for "Blandford" read "Blandford St Mary"; p. 125, for "Dean and Chapter" read "Dean and Canons"; p. 164, it is incorrect to say that "Phillpotts in a footnote denied all knowledge of the publication" in question; p. 232, for "17 November" read "17 December"; p. 262, *The Christian Remembrancer* was published quarterly, not monthly; p. 290, Longley was not Archbishop of Canterbury in 1848; p. 382, the voting specified here took place not in the Upper House of Convocation in April, but in the Lower House in June. It is curious that many published works should be classified as "MS Material" (pp. 401–406). It is regrettable that, in a work which might often be used for reference by local and other historians, the index was not made more complete by the inclusion of the names of places mentioned in the text.

[2] The substance of an address given to the Central Council for Women's Church Work at its meeting on 27 October 1953.

[3] On 18 June 1953.

Council for Women's Church Work, the Bishop of Sheffield did ample justice to the practical issues involved,[1] and his realistic arguments (so far as they go) are convincing and unanswerable. But in the ensuing discussion the Archdeacon of Taunton reminded the Assembly that the question is primarily theological;[2] and my purpose here is to consider woman's place in the *lay* ministry of the Church from the standpoint of the theology of sexual relation—for in most discussions it is hardly recognized that it is at bottom a matter of sex no less than of ministerial order. I hope I may succeed in indicating a line of approach more fruitful than that which has so far failed to lead to any solution.

First, it is necessary to recognize that the question of woman's ministry in the Church is not an isolated, ecclesiastical one. It is simply an aspect of the vast problem of sexual relation which has assumed critical proportions in our time, and it cannot, in the end, be considered apart from the personal and sociological issues connected with woman's status. If this is appreciated at the outset, the discussion is set within its proper context, and the dangers of a purely ecclesiastical (as distinct from a theological) approach may be avoided.

In the New Testament the relation between the sexes is expounded mainly by St Paul, whose views, sooner or later, are invoked in any discussion of the ministry of women. In 1 Corinthians he lays down a principle: "the head of the woman is the man"; the man is "the image and glory of God", and the woman only "the glory of the man".[3] In Ephesians, this doctrine is applied to marriage, the husband being represented as "the head of the wife" (who is to "fear" him), as Christ is "the head of the church".[4] A similar theory of subordination appears in Colossians,[5] and in 1 Peter.[6] On this general principle are based three practical injunctions, the second and third of which may not be strictly Pauline: (i) women must be veiled while they pray or prophesy, because of their subordination;[7] (ii) women must keep silence in church;[8] (iii) women must not teach.[9] The theological elaboration and explication of this theme of subordination and superordination is familiar enough, and need not detain us; it is with the principle itself that we are concerned, and in attempting to assess its validity there are several points to be noticed, and questions to be asked.

(*a*) First, however, we may consider the authority of the injunctions. Whatever may be said for the principle itself, no higher sanction seems to be claimed for the injunctions than that of Church custom and apostolic command. In two cases there seems to be an expression of personal opinion,[10] recalling the contrast in 1 Corin-

---

[1] *Report of the Proceedings of the Church Assembly*, vol. xxxiii, No. 2, pp. 266–9.
[2] Ibid., p. 276.
[3] 1 Cor. 11. 3, 7.
[4] Eph. 5. 22–33.
[5] Col. 3. 18.
[6] 1 Pet. 3. 1–7.
[7] 1 Cor. 11. 3 ff.
[8] 1 Cor. 14. 34–5.
[9] 1 Tim. 2. 12.
[10] 1 Cor. 11. 3—"I would have you know . . ."; 1 Tim. 2. 12—"I permit not . . ."

thians between Christ's teaching and Paul's own decision;[1] the "custom" of the "churches of God",[2] however general, can hardly be taken as equivalent to an article of faith—indeed, the Apostle acknowledges that the Corinthians, who err in the matter of the veiling, "hold fast the *paradoseis*, even as I delivered them to you".[3] Are these Pauline rulings concerning women relevant beyond the particular situations for which they were framed? Presumably there would be a large measure of agreement that they possess no force of themselves outside the context in which they were delivered.

(*b*) Turning now to the principle, it will be noticed that the basis of St Paul's thought is the Genesis 2 creation-myth, which he tends to expound in a rabbinical fashion. This myth represents woman as the last creation. She was made out of, after, and for the man; according to the traditional interpretation, he is virtually her *raison d'être*.[4] In 1 Corinthians no mention is made of the later Genesis 1 creation-myth, in which male and female are created simultaneously as an *imago Dei*;[5] or of God's calling their name *adham*—Man.[6] Here are the germs of two different conceptions of the sexual relation as determined by the Creator: the earlier emphasizes subordination and superordination; the later, confrontation and complementariness. Could St Paul's principle be sustained on the basis of Genesis 1—or even of Genesis 2 supplemented, corrected, and interpreted by Genesis 1?

(*c*) Regardless of P's redactive preface, does the Genesis 2 account express an immutable theological principle, or does it, in fact, simply rationalize in myth-form the empirical situation of woman in contemporary society? It is arguable with much probability that in both Genesis 2 and Genesis 3[7] the references to woman's origin, status, and relation to man are aetiological; and that even the presentation of her part in the "Fall" may reflect the general attitude towards her.

(*d*) To what extent was the principle enunciated in 1 Corinthians determined by the social conditions of the time—conditions not essentially dissimilar from those reflected in the narratives of Genesis 2 and 3? Woman's place in the pattern of first-century life, theoretically and actually, is well attested. Rabbinical literature speaks for the Jewess, and generally in the Hellenistic world domestic conditions had changed but little since Xenophon wrote the *Oikonomikos*. Legally, the Roman concept of *patria potestas* made woman in theory a nonentity who passed at marriage from the *manus* of her father to that of her husband. A legal loophole enabled her to circumvent the law and obtain a measure of independence, and there were many ways in which "emancipation" and

[1] 1 Cor. 7. 10—"I give charge, yea not I, but the Lord"; 7. 12—"to the rest say I, not the Lord".

[2] 1 Cor. 11. 16. [3] 1 Cor. 11. 2.

[4] 1 Cor. 11. 8–9; cf. the reference to the authority of the "law" (in this case, the Genesis 2 passage) in 14. 34.

[5] Gen. 1. 26–7. [6] Gen. 5. 2.

[7] Cf. Gen. 3. 16: "in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee".

cultural syncretism had contributed to ameliorate her lot. But whatever the facts, there can be no doubt about the principle, and the "social codes" of the ancient world (to which the New Testament bears its witness[1]) sufficiently declare her subordinate status in sociological thought. Is this antique view of woman intrinsic to the Gospel; or does it simply represent a situation in the light of which St Paul and others had to legislate temporarily—a situation which they accepted just as they did that of slavery?

(*e*) So far we have not considered the teaching of Ephesians; and it may be contended that here the principle of subordination is more securely based, being related to the union of Christ with the Church. Two points, however, must be noted in this connexion. First, the author is concerned, not with sexual relation in general, but simply with one particular form of sexual relation—that of marriage. He does not argue that what is true of the former must, *a fortiori*, be true of the latter; nor does he attempt to deduce from the superordination and subordination of male and female in the unique union of the "one flesh" any universal principle of sexual union. His teaching, therefore, has at most only an indirect bearing upon the status of woman as such. And second, can the author's conception of the marital relation be accepted unreservedly as valid? Is it essentially a relation of headship and subjection, such as he represents, or must its analogical significance be otherwise defined? Marriage is indeed an analogue of "the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and his Church", but I would suggest that the particular form in which the analogy is expressed in Ephesians owes its origin to the same matrimonial pattern as that reflected in the law and social custom of antiquity. In contemporary marriage the author saw an illustration of the supernatural union in which "Christ . . . is the head of the church"; and this perception enabled him to teach, in terms of the Heavenly Bridegroom and his Bride, the spiritual and ethical significance of the familiar "order" subsisting between the average husband and wife of that time. But the analogy itself is independent of any particular social pattern; its enduring basis is the fact that the *henosis* of Christ and the Church is reproduced in the *henosis* of the "one flesh", and that in each case the relation is constituted and maintained by a mutual love of unique quality. The subordination *motif* is accidental and not intrinsic to the Christian theology of marriage.

Against this Pauline conception of man as the "head" of the woman (which has been accepted as axiomatic in most discussions of the ministry of women) both theological and practical arguments can be brought. But first, let justice be done to St Paul. One of his great contributions to our understanding of male and female is that he perceived a divinely appointed *structure* in sexual relation. His mistake, however, was that he sought to discover the nature of this structure from the social and matrimonial patterns of his time, and thus inevitably came to define it in terms of hierarchical order. I shall return to this question of the structure of sexual relation later.

[1] See E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St Peter*, pp. 101 ff., and Essay II.

In discussing the headship of the male, the teaching of Barth and Brunner cannot be ignored; both agree at least in this, that the *imago Dei* in Man consists in responsible personal confrontation, and we have already seen that the later creation-myth of Genesis 1 suggests that male and female in relation are, in a special sense, an image of God. Barth insists[1] that man and woman are commanded by God their Creator to affirm the twin facts of their sexual differentiation and sexual complementariness by living (socially as well as in marriage) in responsibility and belongingness together before him. Sexual antagonism—and, I would suggest though Barth would demur here[2]), sexual subordination and superordination—constitute a denial of God's purpose, and disobedience to his will. They spring from sin, and especially that of the male, who has exploited the circumstances of woman's life, and her physical and psychical idiosyncrasies, so as to create a social situation in his favour—an order of which he has constituted himself the centre, and which he has manipulated in his own interest. Do we see anything of this androcentricity in the Christian ministry?

In Christ there is "no male and female" as antiquity knew male and female.[3] Sex is neither abolished nor transcended, but sexual division and antagonism are done away, and with them, traditional notions of headship and subjection, of superiority and inferiority. Instead, there comes into being a new creation which is yet the realization of God's original purpose, "the new man, which is being renewed unto knowledge after the *image* of him that created him"[4]—and created him as male and female, in a relation of unity in which the Being of the Trinity is reflected. Whatever else this may imply, it surely means that in the Church there should be seen a restoration of the true pattern of sexual relation—man and woman living and working in real partnership, and thus exhibiting a renewal of that belongingness in which and for which they were created. If so, it must find expression in terms of the ministry of the Church.

One further theological consideration: it may, perhaps, be objected that in the Trinity, of which man-woman is an image, there is hierarchical order, and that subordination must accordingly find a place in all sexual relation. Even if this were accepted, it would not necessarily be apparent which was the subordinate and which the superordinate sex; adoption of the opinion of the Cappadocian Fathers (to which the Church is not committed) that the Father has a *principium* in the Godhead could not, without the gravest danger, be interpreted as conferring a corresponding *principium* upon the human male. But in fact the hierarchical conception of the Trinity is by no means generally accepted, and it is sufficient to recall Dr Leonard Hodgson's observations on the attempt to explain the

[1] *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik*, III/4, pp. 127 ff.

[2] Ibid., pp. 188 ff. For some criticism of Barth in this connexion, see K. Bliss, "Male and Female", in THEOLOGY, June 1952, p. 212, and D. S. Bailey, "Sexual Relationship and the Command of God", in *The Churchman*, June 1953, pp. 87–8.

[3] Gal. 3. 28.

[4] Col. 3. 10 (my italics).

mystery of the Godhead in terms of an over-simplified and quasi-mathematical notion of "unity".[1] The structure of the human sexual relation also is too complex to admit of any such simple explanation.

Turning now to more practical matters, we may ask: What exactly does 'headship' mean? Has the male universally some specific endowment, denied to the female, which fits him alone for the exercise of the responsibilities and functions of headship? Here we can only generalize empirically, and the evidence available is not necessarily conclusive. Making due allowance for the persistent androcentricity of our society (however plausibly it may be concealed), it is clear that woman can be as efficient (if not more efficient) in the discharge of routine duties than man; and that as few men as women have the gifts and qualities requisite for creative and inspiring leadership. It is clear, too, that the male has no monopoly of the capacity to make sound decisions and to plan policies. In fine, "headship" can be exercised as effectively by woman as by man—but she will always exercise it in *her* way, and he in *his*.

There seems as little practical as theological warrant for the arbitrary assumption that the male has been destined by God for headship. Rather, it may be said that he has sought, by a self-devised theory of headship, to justify and maintain the status of social privilege which he has assumed, claiming that *his* way of exercising headship is alone the right and safe way. There are certain kinds of rule (sovereignty, for example) which can be and have been efficiently exercised by either sex; equally, there are situations in which the gifts of one sex will have fuller scope than those of the other. But it is dangerous to argue from the functional to the ontological; it is of slight importance *who* makes or articulates a decision, *who* plans or carries out a procedure or policy, so long as the point of origin in every case is a real sexual partnership. Thus, in the basic natural community of the family (which is often cited in support of the traditional view) "headship" is not the prerogative of the father, but of the "one flesh"—father and mother in creative partnership.

These considerations are by no means irrelevant to the question of the ministry of women. What factors govern our approach to it? What, unconsciously or consciously, tends to influence the course of discussion and the framing of decisions? Some answers to these questions have already been suggested, and they deserve careful attention.

(i) It is commonly supposed that the Pauline principle of the subordination of woman is theologically sound, if unpalatable; and that it expresses a fundamental truth concerning the constitution of humanity. This proposition can no longer be allowed to pass unchallenged, and is likely to prove untenable.

(ii) The Pauline prohibitions have usually been accepted as in some sense a guide to ecclesiastical practice; but the Anglican Church in this country has already set aside that relating to veiling, and the rejection of the principle of the subordination of women would deprive the others of their force.

[1] See *The Doctrine of the Trinity*, pp. 89 ff., etc.

(iii) There is a tendency, quite unwarrantable, to infer theological principles from facts, such as that the Twelve were men—again, mainly on *a priori* grounds. No regard is usually paid to the obvious practical explanation of Jesus' choice; nor to the position of women in his circle, and in the primitive Church—a phenomenon of some relevance to the question under discussion.

(iv) Church tradition, often accepted uncritically, is a very influential factor. But some of the formative elements in that tradition are now so deeply submerged as to pass undetected; they would be repudiated if recognized, but their influence persists in ways which do not suggest its origin. Such are certain levitical notions of "uncleanness"; something also of what is called *mana* has often been attributed to woman because of her sexual processes, and she has even been regarded as a specially "sexual" being. This, coupled with the well-known patristic, and even medieval, attitude to physical sexuality, explains much. Traces of this complex view of woman are to be found in ecclesiastical regulations, sometimes supported by Old Testament proof-texts; for instance, she might not approach near to the altar,[1] nor receive the Sacrament with uncovered hands.[2] Pope Gregory had to assure Augustine of Canterbury that it was not improper for a menstruating woman to enter the church, and to receive the Holy Communion.[3] To these crude notions must be added the opinions given currency by many of the Fathers: woman is weak, foolish, of low intellectual capacity—and, of course, always in some sense a temptress! I do not suggest that these views are now held; but they contributed to the formation of an attitude to woman which many still desire to maintain in the name of the "tradition of the Church". Even the Reformation was retrogressive in its emphasis upon a patriarchal, Old Testament pattern of family life and sexual relation, in which Sarah is still to call her husband "lord". Not to elaborate further, it is well to recognize that there are elements of superstition, ignorance, and prejudice, deeply embedded in the ecclesiastical tradition to which appeal is often made when the ministry of women is under discussion.

(v) Nor ought it to be forgotten that underlying personal reactions to the question on both sides there may be unsuspected psychological factors.

(vi) We must not dismiss lightly the influence of the contemporary pattern of society upon our ecclesiastical attitudes; it continues in subtle (and sometimes not so subtle) ways to proclaim its fundamental androcentricity.

---

[1] *Conc. Laodic.* (fourth cent.), 44. The scholiast John Zonaras explains that this prohibition is due to the fact that women are unwillingly, but nevertheless truly, polluted by menstruation. This canon was re-enacted, in substance, several times, e.g. *Capit. Theod. episc. Aurelian.* (797), vi; *Conc. I Aquisgran.* (816), i. 82; etc.

[2] *Conc. Autiss.* (? 578), 36; canon 37 forbids a woman to touch the pall (*palla*) or altar cloth.

[3] *Epist.* xi. 64, *resp. ad q. 10*; but Gregory thinks that she shows greater reverence if she abstains from reception of the Sacrament during the time of menstruation.

(vii) Woman herself, by over-diffidence and undue acquiescence, has appeared sometimes to assent to man's valuation of her—and of himself; and she has always been seriously handicapped in her attempts to achieve true partnership by the assumptions with which he has buttressed his position in society.

So much for some of the factors which tend to govern our approach to the problem of woman's ministry in the Church. Clearly, the first step towards a solution must be to clarify the theological issues involved; inquiry needs to be made afresh into the Biblical and historical presuppositions upon which discussion is generally based, with particular attention to their relevance to-day. I am bound to conclude that there seems no valid reason why woman should be excluded at least from the *lay* ministerial functions open to man; but we do not know what distinctive gifts she may have to bring to the ministry—and this leads me to my final point.

There is, as St Paul perceived, a structure in sexual relation, and there is good reason to think that this structure is one of complementariness and partnership, and not of subordination and superordination. So much we can say; but we do not know in the abstract what this means, any more than we know in the abstract the meaning of sex itself. God has not declared the nature of the order which he has set between the sexes, and we fall into the Apostle's mistake if we attempt to deduce it from any contemporary social pattern. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the structure of sexual relation, as ordained by God, can only be discovered in the way he has willed—that is, in and through relation itself, in all its infinite variety, through the experience of man and woman as they live and work together in responsible partnership, and so learn their respective gifts, capacities, and limitations.

Hence we cannot presume to state categorically what precise form woman's ministry in the Church should take; God will make that known to us when we show ourselves willing to obey his command to the sexes to live in real partnership and interdependence, ecclesiastically as well as socially and maritally. Is it simply for woman to *do* what man *does* in the Church—is that what woman really wants? Those who advocate and those who oppose the ministry of women in these terms take a very superficial view of the question. A true theology of sexual relation goes much deeper; it requires that woman be accepted freely and willingly as man's *essential partner* in the whole work of the ministry, and confronts ecclesiastical authority with the question: What is the *whole* ministry to which God calls the *whole* Man, created in his image as a unity of male and female? There is a challenge here, not only to theological thought, but also to adventurousness in practice. There must be an open-minded readiness to attempt reasonable experiments, and above all, to explore and exploit to the full all the opportunities for partnership which already exist where, for example, clergymen and women church workers share common concerns in such fields as education and "moral welfare". I can see no theological objection to any competent woman being authorized to perform the duties of a lay

reader, but I do not believe that the problem of woman's ministry in the Church can be solved simply by agreeing to fit her into any ecclesiastical scheme. Her desire is not for the priesthood or for any ministerial status *as such*, but for acceptance into partnership with man, and acknowledgement as the Other without whom he cannot accomplish the service of God in the Church. When the real point at issue is appreciated, and the principle of complementation in partnership has been admitted, discussion of such administrative details as may be necessary can proceed in an atmosphere more conducive to a satisfactory solution than has yet obtained.

SHERWIN BAILEY.

The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood

THE New Testament offers very little direct guidance on the problem of the ordination of women to the priesthood, and discussion of the Scriptural evidence too frequently takes the form merely of an inconclusive exchange of isolated texts. There appears therefore to be some need of a more general Biblical approach to the subject. The following article is an attempt to consider the question in the light of (i) the Biblical connexion between the concept of priesthood and the concept of dominion, and (ii) the connexion between the prophetic and priestly offices, and to relate the whole problem to the doctrine of the Eucharist. For the purpose of this discussion the distinctive function of the priest at the Eucharist will be regarded as twofold: the offering of the bread and wine, and the saying of the Prayer of Consecration.[1] The precise nature of the eucharistic offering is a matter of some dispute, but it would be generally agreed that it represents, from one aspect at least, the sacrificial offering to God of his own gifts to us in creation and is therefore, as Mr Scott has described it, "an exercise of our priesthood towards the material creation".[2] It is this aspect of the Eucharist which is of importance for the present argument.

(i) The ideas of priesthood and dominion are found linked together in both the Old Testament and the New Testament. In the Flood narrative in Genesis we find that a remnant of the creation is preserved by Noah and offered by him in sacrifice to God after the waters have subsided, and that he is then re-established by God in his dominion over the created world (Gen. 8. 15—9. 2). In the Isaianic picture of the glories of the Age to Come, the people of Israel are to rule over the other nations of the world, and are them-

[1] For these two actions as the distinctive office of the bishop in pre-Nicene times, later delegated to the presbyter, see Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, pp. 111, 268.

[2] W. M. F. Scott, "The Eucharist and the Heavenly Ministry of our Lord" (THEOLOGY, lvi, 392, February 1953). According to Gregory Dix (*The Shape of the Liturgy*, pp. 113–14), Irenaeus lays particular emphasis on the eucharistic offering as the "firstfruits of creation".

selves to be named the priests of the Lord (Is. 60. 10 ff.; 61. 5 ff.). The two ideas are found again in Psalm 110. In the New Testament the connexion of priesthood and dominion occurs in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where Christ is shown to be the fulfilment of both concepts. He is the fulfilment of those passages of the Old Testament which claim for man dominion over the created world (Heb. 2. 6–9), and also of the Messianic kingship prophesied in Psalms 2 and 110 (Heb. 1. 13). The whole epistle is the exposition of Christ's fulfilment of the idea of priesthood. And the linking of priesthood with dominion is further emphasized by the fact that Melchizedek, who is the type of Christ, is king as well as priest. Finally, that which is prophesied in the Old Testament and fulfilled in the redemptive work of Christ is also fulfilled in the life of the redeemed community (Apoc. 5. 10).

The fact that the Old Testament passages mentioned above occur in narratives or prophecies which the early Church used to explain and illustrate the saving work of Christ,[1] and the fact also that Christ fulfils in his own Person both the concept of dominion and the concept of priesthood, may help to indicate that the linking together of the two ideas is not merely fortuitous but has some theological meaning. The reason why dominion involves priesthood is plainly that man is a creature, and if he is to exercise dominion he must do so in accordance with the will of the Creator by whom it was given to him. He thus becomes the mediator of God's will and purpose to those over whom he rules, and he must in some sense continually offer his subjects and his realm in sacrifice to God, instead of considering them his own property.[2] The reason for the reverse connexion, the necessity of dominion for the exercise of priesthood, is not so obvious. All that we are here concerned to notice is that all Christian priesthood depends upon the exercise of one particular form of dominion: the dominion over death and sin which is the consequence of the Resurrection of Christ. According to the Epistle to the Hebrews, the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ himself derives its efficacy from the fact that, unlike the priesthood and sacrifice of the Old Israel, it is neither limited by death nor made imperfect by sin (Heb. 7).[3] The reason for this is presumably to be found in the idea of priesthood as securing access to the presence of God, the consequent necessity for holiness on the part of the priest (foreshadowed by the Levitical regulations), and the idea of death as separation from God. The priesthood and sacrifice of the Church is also de-

[1] See 1 Pet. 3. 20–21 for the Flood as a type of salvation through the waters of baptism. In Mark 12. 36–7 Christ is represented as making use of Ps. 110 in his teaching about the Messiah. According to Dr C. H. Dodd, Is. 61 is to be included "among the scriptures determinative of the early Christian understanding of the Gospel": *According to the Scriptures*, p. 94.

[2] See Westcott, *Hebrews*, p. 203, on the combination of kingly and priestly offices.

[3] Westcott comments on Heb. 7. 17: "It must be further noticed that the possession of this indissoluble life is not only the characteristic of Christ's exercise of his priestly office: it is the ground on which he entered upon it." Ibid., p. 187.

pendent upon the victory of the Resurrection. In the First Epistle of Peter we read that believers are "built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ" (1 Pet. 2. 5). A comparison of parallel ideas in other New Testament writings shows that the "spiritual house", the New Temple, is to be identified with the Resurrection Body of Christ (John 2. 19–20; cf. 1 Cor. 3. 16 and 1 Cor. 12. 12–13), and that the sacrifice in question is the sacrifice of obedience made possible by the believer being incorporated into the Body of Christ and sharing in his Death and Resurrection (Rom. 12. 1; Rom. 6). It is reasonable therefore to suppose that man's exercise, in the Eucharist, of his priesthood towards the material creation will likewise depend upon the dominion over death and sin which is the result of the Resurrection, and this supposition is confirmed by an examination of Rom. 8. 19–23. These verses imply both that man has some priestly office to perform as regards creation, and also that his performance of it depends upon his own redemption, that is, upon his own deliverance from corruption and mortality. It follows from this that his anticipatory exercise of this priesthood in the Eucharist depends upon his anticipatory dominion, in the power of the Holy Spirit, over the forces which now govern the natural order.[1] These forces are the forces of death. The fact that man is subject to death means that he is part of the natural order and subordinate to it, being subject to the laws which govern the animal creation.[2] Dominion over death, therefore, means the recovery of man's proper dominion over the natural world, and it is this dominion over creation which is necessary for the exercise of man's priesthood towards creation.

We turn now to the accounts of the Creation in Genesis. In the first Creation story God bestows upon man dominion over the whole of the created world (Gen. 1. 28). This universal dominion presumably implies a universal priesthood. Since it is given to male and female alike, man's priestly office towards the creation must also belong to both male and female. As a result of the Fall, however, the woman loses her prerogative of dominion and becomes subject to the man (Gen. 3. 16), thus becoming part of the created order over which man (*vir*) rules. The consequences of the Fall are thus twofold. Man's rejection of his Creator means that he sets himself up as his own god, which implies dominion over his fellow-men. This is realized in the dominance of *vir* over *femina*. But from another aspect the rejection of God's sovereignty means that man cannot properly exercise the dominion over creation originally bestowed upon him.[3] The ground is cursed for the sake of Adam, and half the

[1] It is obviously impossible for man to be the mediator of God's will towards the creation, and to offer it in sacrifice to God, if he himself is not in control of the natural order but part of it and subordinate to it, especially as the creation itself is in some way hostile to God. See J. A. T. Robinson, *The Body*, p. 22.

[2] See Robinson, op. cit., pp. 34–5.

[3] The *imago Dei* includes both obedience and dominion (Phil. 2. 6–11). The perversion of one must result in the perversion of the other.

human race becomes itself a part of the non-human created order. Women are the possessions of men in much the same way as they possess flocks and herds. This is significantly expressed in the Decalogue (Ex. 20. 17), and also by the fact that during the earlier part of Old Testament history (and, in the case of the monarch, as late as the beginning of the Exile) the number of a man's wives and concubines increased in proportion to the increase of his material wealth.

Therefore, since the female half of the human race lost the privilege of dominion, the accompanying priestly function was also lost. The priesthood of Israel was an exclusively male priesthood, representative of a priestly nation whose membership was fully and properly open only to men. The religions of Canaan, on the other hand, which used the services of women priestesses, significantly took the form not of sacrifices to the one true God but of the worship of the Baalim and the subordination of man to natural forces (Hos. 2; 4. 13–14).[1]

Christ is the Second Adam. By his Incarnation, Death and Resurrection he reverses the transgression of the first Adam and nullifies the results of the Fall, becoming the Head of the new, redeemed humanity, and the firstfruits of the resurrection and restoration of the whole of creation (1 Cor. 15). By means of Christ's victory over the powers of death, man recovers his dominion over the corruptible natural order to which he was formerly subject.

The Church is the Resurrection Body of Christ, and in the life of the Church the new humanity is continually becoming an established reality (Col. 3. 10). Moreover, it is in the Eucharist, supremely and particularly, that the Church becomes from day to day what she already is, continually realizing her existence as the Body of the risen, ascended and glorified Christ. In the Eucharist the believer already possesses eternal life, the life of the Resurrection (John 6. 52–8).[2] He is freed from bondage to the natural order which is subject to death and decay, and he asserts his own God-given dominion over creation, for he uses the natural elements of bread and wine to minister not to the natural body, which is sown in corruption, but to the spiritual body, which is to be raised in incorruption. And in the offering of the elements man exercises again his priesthood in relation to the created world.

What follows from this? Briefly to recapitulate the argument, it has been indicated that in Holy Scripture dominion and priesthood

[1] In man's fallen state, *femina* is the link between *vir* and nature. Because man is a dependent creature and has need of an object of worship, if he rejects altogether the worship of God he turns to worship the only other thing set over against him as separate from himself, that is, the natural order. This is presumably the theological reason for female priesthoods in the non-Jewish religions of the pre-Christian era.

[2] The discourse referred to here may not be primarily and originally eucharistic (see J. E. L. Oulton, *Holy Communion and Holy Spirit*, p. 75, for a defence of the argument of Westcott to this effect), but most commentators are agreed that the Evangelist himself interpreted the original discourse in terms of his own eucharistic doctrine. See E. C. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, ad loc.; Vincent Taylor, *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching*, p. 154; C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 338.

are significantly linked together, that at the Creation dominion over the natural world was bestowed upon male and female alike, but that as a result of the Fall this dominion was perverted and partly lost, and that the female half of mankind, no longer exercising dominion, lost altogether the accompanying priestly function. We have also said that in the work of Christ and in the life of the Church, particularly in the Eucharist, the results of the Fall are abolished. This must surely mean that, with regard to the particular aspect of the Fall which we are considering, there is restored to women that equal dominion over creation which was originally theirs, and this in turn presumably implies, since dominion involves priesthood, that the priestly office should be bestowed upon women as well as upon men. The argument has shown at least that there was some theological reason for women being debarred from the exercise of the priestly function in the Old Israel, and that this reason is no longer operative in the Church. It is true that in general terms the priestly function has been to some extent regained by the women members of the Church. The sacrament of Baptism, administered to men and women alike, not the rite of circumcision, is the means of entry into the royal priesthood which is the New Israel. Whatever priestly functions belong to the laity in general belong to women as well as to men. And this accords with the fact that the Holy Spirit, who gives to believers that freedom from the mind of the flesh which ensures man's proper dominion over nature, is given to both men and women. But is this enough? We have seen that the male priesthood of Israel was theologically significant, representing as it did a priestly people consisting only of men, and an unredeemed humanity whose female members were part of the natural order governed, in however perverted a fashion, by man (*vir*). The Christian priesthood should be representative of redeemed humanity, of a priestly people consisting of both men and women. But in its present form it would seem to represent the Old Israel rather than the New. By denying the priesthood to women, the Church comes dangerously near to denying the implications of Baptism, and seems to indicate that in the action of the Eucharist itself mankind remains fallen and unredeemed.

(ii) Approaching the problem from another angle, we may, more briefly, use in support of the proposal for the ordination of women the argument that both in the Old Testament and the New Testament we find women are called to the prophetic office. In the Old Testament the prophetic and priestly offices are entirely separate. But Christ is both Prophet and Priest, and the ministry of his Church, during the greater part of its history, has also combined the prophetic and priestly functions. The Scriptural warrant for this is presumably to be found in John 6. 52–63, where Word and Sacrament are inseparably linked together. Moreover, the ministry of the Word is the means whereby the ascended Lord of the Church speaks to his people, and the minister of the Word is thus the representative of the ascended Christ. But the Christ who is seated at the right hand of God is also incarnate in the Church, his Body, and the Church's

priesthood, in the Eucharist, is representative of the Body. To separate the prophetic and priestly offices, therefore, would seem to be analogous to introducing a separation in the Person of Christ. Also, in the Eucharist itself the saying of the Prayer of Consecration and the action which accompanies it perhaps belongs rather to the prophetic than to the priestly office. The words of institution are the words of Christ and are therefore the Word of the Lord, and the action, with the words, may be regarded as an example of prophetic symbolism. If then the ministry of the Church is an inseparable combination of the prophetic and priestly functions, and if women have in time past been called to exercise one of these functions, there seems to be very little reason why they should not be allowed to exercise both, especially as the objection to their exercise of the priestly function is not valid in the life of the New Israel.

Finally, as part of our consideration of the prophetic office and function, we must make some attempt to decide what value is to be attached to the individual sense of vocation to the ministry which some women claim at the present day. Are they mistaken because the call has not come through the Church? This objection is not to be lightly dismissed. The prophet of the Old Israel received his call direct from God. The Word of the Lord came to Amos or Jeremiah mediated by no human agency and altogether independent of the will and action of the Church of the Old Covenant. But Christ is the Word Incarnate, and the Church of the New Covenant is his Body. It is reasonable therefore to suppose that the prophet of the New Israel will normally receive his call through the agency of the Church. But we have seen that there are grounds for believing that in the matter of the ordination of women the Church at the present moment behaves more like the Old Israel than the New. It is possible that in the present situation the calling of women to the ministry of the Church may follow the pattern of the prophetic calling in the Old Testament, and that some attention should be given to the individual claim to vocation. May we at least reiterate the plea that those who are responsible for the training of the sacred ministry should "prove the spirits, whether they are of God"?

M. E. Thrall.

Promises

Sooner or later in the course of their training for the ministry, Anglican ordinands are made aware that clergymen of the Church of England are required at the time of their ordination, and occasionally thereafter, to subscribe to the following:

"I . . . do solemnly make the following declaration, I assent to the 39 Articles of Religion and the Book of Common Prayer and of ordering of Bishops, Priests and Deacons. I believe the doctrine of the Church of England therein set forth to be agreeable to the Word of God and in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments I will use the form in the said book prescribed and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority."

Supposing that scrupulous ordinands are reassured in the matter of the 39 Articles by the arguments usually advanced in textbooks,[1] they are still faced with a promise. They may feel that the general sense of that promise, in spite of the reference to the excepting power of "lawful authority", is to use the Prayer Book of 1662: they observe that the habit of using parts of the book proposed in 1928 is now so common that any priest will almost certainly be called upon to use that book soon after his ordination: and they are inclined to doubt whether the obscurity of the phrase "lawful authority"[2] justifies them in placing an interpretation upon it which might well be rejected in a court of law. Nor can they be reassured by the experience of older clergymen, since the problem in this form has not arisen so acutely for most of the present ordained clergy: they, it is true, may have been compelled by the *force majeure* of circumstances to break a promise originally made in good faith. But that is a very different thing from making a promise in the full knowledge that it will be broken.

An experienced clergyman, consulted on the point, will normally seek to allay the misgivings of such a doubter: he will be told that most men now feel this difficulty at some time or another, but that very few have felt its force enough to postpone their ordination; his attention will be drawn to the historical context in which this promise was drafted, and to the unlikelihood of the drafters having intended to fasten a fixed liturgy on to all succeeding generations of Anglicans for ever. The honest attempts of the Church to mend matters in the setting of the Establishment will be explained to him, with particular reference to the modification of the declaration of Assent which was introduced in 1865 expressly to relieve consciences: much emphasis also will be laid on the current revision of canon law, for this project clearly shows the energy and good intentions of the Church, even if it is hard to see when the task of revision will be completed, or with what precise effect. Furthermore, the doubter will be reminded of the "hierarchy of promises", and warned of the dangers of over-scrupulosity—especially in view of the deviations from the strict letter of the 1662 Book (e.g. hymns) which have been current for many years yet do not, apparently, trouble his conscience. In general he will be left in no doubt of the practical necessity for making the best of perplexing circumstances and conflicting doctrines in a difficult world: and in these matters he will be invited to appreciate the traditionally flexible and empirical temper of the Church of England.

The stomachs of ordination candidates are notoriously queasy, and it may well be that a sedative of this kind is all that is needed. But it is arguable that a man in perplexity does not need soothing, he needs to come to a decision: above all, when he is to be ordained to the ministry, he needs to see what he is doing, and be quite clear about his reasons for doing it. In this case he should presumably consider first whether this promise is in fact, as I have

[1] E.g., Bicknell, 2nd ed., p. 27.

[2] Cp. *The Canon Law of the Church of England* (1947), pp. 215-223.

suggested, a promise to use the 1662 Book, since Parliament has rejected the Deposited Book. The answer seems to turn on the interpretation of the expression "lawful authority", and it is of course possible to maintain that not Parliament but some other entity is referred to, such as one's diocesan or one's own conscience. Apart from the other considerations raised by such solutions, it is at least clear that however we interpret the "lawful authority" which alone can vary our usage of the 1662 Book, the mere attempt to get the Deposited Book through Parliament implied that Parliament was then regarded as at any rate a law-making, if not a lawful, authority. It may be distasteful to conclude that Parliament has the right to regulate the public worship of the Church of England, but the distastefulness of a conclusion is no reason for not reaching it. Above all, however obscure the exact meaning of the promise might be, the promise could not thereby be annulled. For either the promise is a promise to do or refrain from something, or it is not: if it is, it should be kept: if it is not, why make it?

Secondly, suppose that the promise is in fact a genuine one, and no less binding because some people think it obscure. In that case, since promise-breaking is generally wrong, do the circumstances of the priesthood justify a man in making a promise which he knows he cannot keep? Here the sedative argument seems to depend on two very questionable assumptions: the first is that there is nothing at all out of the way or disquieting in abandoning a principle when sticking to it will cause trouble; the second is that the general upset and distress which would certainly follow a strict application of principle in this particular case would in fact outweigh the hypothetical benefits of "rigorism".

The first assumption deserves some examination, since it lies in various forms behind many decisions. It is of course customary among the English, who for many years have been proud of their "empirical" approach to practical problems, especially in contrast to the "doctrinaire" procedure of the "logical" French. The English horror of "logic" is really only a very reasonable dislike of bad logic, and a man will disparage a proposal as "too tidy and logical" who thinks logically every time he buys a railway ticket. But logic has nevertheless acquired a bad name, and most men are readily put off any course of action which is labelled "logical", simply because they feel it will not take account of the facts. We are accordingly often reluctant to act avowedly on principle for fear of seeming doctrinaire or "unrealistic", although most men do in fact act with strong and good (even if unacknowledged) *a priori* principles: furthermore it is often assumed that it is more "responsible" and realistic to deal with a problem by considering the facts alone, by "taking each case on its merits". Yet the circumstances of any given case are usually so complicated that it is often possible to argue sincerely and forcefully for a sensible and practical approach which later can be seen to be quite mistaken. A good instance of this complexity of affairs occurred in 1904, when the then Archbishop of Canterbury disappointed many Christians by failing to condemn outright a proposal to em-

ploy Chinese labourers in South Africa in conditions which were widely felt to be inhuman. The episode[1] became unjustly ill-famed, but is a first-rate example of how a subtle mind may become so sensitive to complex considerations and repercussions that it loses sight of some comparatively simple principle. Arguments from expediency have of course their place in forming decisions; but they are notoriously so difficult to handle justly that we should surely examine them very carefully indeed before putting aside the general moral principles which we are accustomed to recommend so warmly to our children. The general moral principle in the present case is that promise-breaking is wrong.

The second questionable assumption behind the sedative argument is that the Church would lose more than she would gain by a strict interpretation of principle in this case. Suppose that the Church decided that it is wrong to compel men to make pie-crust promises: then one of three things would follow: *either* this promise would have to be kept, *or* it would have to be altered, *or* no more men could be ordained under the present establishment of the Church. All these possibilities raise the awkward question of Establishment, too large to discuss here: but it is at least worth noticing that the present nature of the Establishment compels men to begin their ministry either with a quibble or with a promise which they do not intend to keep. No one can say how much or how little damage this does to the Church; but if we begin our ministry with a muddled promise, how can we be expected to avoid confusion in dealing with promises of other kinds? How, for instance, can we assess the status of marriage vows, and the worth of arguments like the following, which occurs in a recent book[2] on sex? (The writer is considering the marriage vows of the Anglican marriage service.)

> "John pledges fidelity, not to Mary, but to Mary-married; Mary pledges fidelity, not to John, but to John-married. That is to say, both imply that their 'vow and covenant' is to be operative, not absolutely, but in a certain context; 'living faithfully together', they are to perform and keep it. Fidelity is promised to the faithful. . . . When love fails and a marriage breaks down beyond all hope of restoration, it is difficult to see what real meaning attaches any longer to the 'vow and covenant'."

Herod, it may be said, is implicitly censured by St Matthew (14. 9) for rigid adherence to a promise: certainly faithfulness and obedience are not the whole of Christian life, and the early history of the Franciscan order shows clearly enough what pitfalls await those who try to do exactly what our Lord told us to do. Furthermore it is easy and often misleading to select any particular set of facts as a cause of the Church's troubles, or to point to any one particular course of action as a solution. Nevertheless there are troubles, and they do have solutions: and I suggest that the English and especially the Anglican habit of applauding decisions as "practical" and "responsible", or condemning them as "unrealistic" or "rigorous", has often inhibited us from applying the more elementary categories of good

[1] *Randall Davidson*, by G. K. A. Bell, I, 26.
[2] *The Mystery of Love and Marriage*, by D. S. Bailey, pp. 84–5.

and bad, true and false, right and wrong: it has accordingly concealed from us the disadvantages of our present practice in the matter of this promise, and has cast a too lurid light on the possible consequences of action. For in the matter of Establishment we are now trying to eat our cake and have it: although the Church is by law established, a generally light-hearted attitude to the law of the land is common in the Church: it seems already to be thought Erastian to worry about "technical illegalities": and enthusiasts for liturgical reform will cheerfully remark of some intrinsically good innovation, "Of course it's all quite illegal!" As long as this goes on we are availing ourselves of the benefits of Establishment, while refusing to submit to its disabilities.

This promise is not the most important aspect of the relation between Church and State, and it is certainly not the most important matter on which ordinands have to make a decision: it simply happens to be a place where the shoe of Establishment rubs hard enough to raise a blister, and its treatment is a good example of the way in which we approach, or shirk, the whole issue. For when all is said the fact remains that it involves the priest either in a quibble over the exact meaning of the promise, or in promise-breaking of the ordinary, nursery, kind, or in mere evasion: it may well be that most ordinands, if asked to justify the usual practice, would reply, "I wish this promise was not imposed on me; nevertheless I do feel truly called to the priesthood, and if it involves this kind of thing, still I must go through with it." I can myself think of no other possible reply: it forms a striking contrast to the other promises and subscriptions I have made in the past, the oath of allegiance on enlisting, subscription to the Official Secrets Act on entering the Government service; however, I can understand the argument that the priesthood is *sui generis* and cannot be expected to form a close parallel to these other callings. But, still, it is a strange beginning to the ministry.

M. J. M. Paton.

More about Parables

Jesus spoke many things in parables. Our theology speaks in parables hardly at all. Mr Dammers' article in the February issue has set this contrast vividly before us and has challenged us to practise the parabolic method not merely as a practical aid to preaching and teaching but as a theological discipline. But must we not take the process one step further back?

There are many forms of moral discipline which fail to achieve their aim, because they concentrate on the symptoms rather than the root failings, on the correction of the externals of behaviour rather than on the transformation of the springs of conduct. Parables sprang naturally to the mind of Jesus, because the world around him spoke to him of God. Parables, when we use them, are more often artificially wrought by the studious application of the craft of sermon

illustration. Our thinking must be dealt with at a more radical level. True moral progress comes when our desires are transformed and recreated through worship. We shall speak in living parables when our thinking has been transformed and recreated at the same deep level by the same means. We shall not be able to bridge the gap between our faith and the world around us, unless its contemporary images are woven into the very texture of our worship.

Our present forms of worship make great use of imagery, of compressed parables, but they are the images and parables of the past. They derive from two main sources. There is the rich and vivid imagery of the Psalter. "The Lord is my stony rock . . . magnify him that rideth upon the heavens as it were upon an horse . . . I stick fast in the deep mire, where no ground is . . . like as the hart desireth the water-brooks, so longeth my soul after thee, O God . . . I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of ungodliness." (Pss. 18. 1; 68. 4; 69. 2; 42. 1; 84. 11.) To the psalmist all these were live images; few of them are to us. And there are images, which emerge from the teaching of the New Testament. "We have erred and strayed from thy ways like lost sheep . . . put upon us the armour of light." The parable of the lost sheep and St Paul's description of the whole armour of God were living images, when they were first used; for us to-day they have little vitality remaining as imagery at all.

The modern poet is concerned to tackle a similar problem and it may be that we can learn something from him. In *The Poetic Image*, Cecil Day Lewis speaks of the poet's task as a vocation in a sense which the religious man can well appreciate (pp. 98–100):

> A poem must be concerned with the present, must show comprehension of its age; yet the present is a confused spectacle, baffling comprehension, and our own present, we may add, is the most bewildering which poets have had to face. . . . The image is a drawing back from the actual, the better to come to grips with it; so every successful image is a sign of a successful encounter with the real. . . . The poet wishes to see meaning in everything.

The task is so difficult that many shirk it altogether, while others attempt it and fail. He continues (pp. 100–104):

> Poets of low vitality ensconce themselves like hermit-crabs, generation after generation, in the cast-off shells of their predecessors. . . . The poet of high vitality, and he alone, is strong enough to live in the present, to wrestle with its Protean nature and pin it down to an original form. . . . The image, as surely to-day as in primitive times, is a method of asserting or reasserting spiritual control over the material. So . . . if a twentieth-century poet belabours us with engines and aircraft, pylons and dialectics and psycho-analysis, bombs and guns, Groddeck and Kierkegaard, we must bear with him, for he is however ineptly about the poet's old business of bringing emotional order out of material and intellectual confusion.

He then goes on to ask how the poet is to set about this task. For the modern poet nothing is inherently unpoetic, but his success as a poet will depend not only on his own imaginative response to the objects of the world around him, but also on how far those objects

have been assimilated by the general imagination. It is just here that the difficulty lies. If it is true that nothing is inherently unpoetic for the modern poet, it is equally true that for the modern man nothing is inherently poetic. He develops this idea with an interesting example (pp. 107–8):

> For telegraph poles to enter the general imagination, we must have experienced them poetically—seen the forest tree in the stripped pole, heard along the wire the voices of crisis and commonplace. Now it is the poet's job, certainly, to make the telegraph poles poetic for us in this way. But this particular job is more difficult for him to-day, because he gets no help from the general imagination and therefore his images have to start from the cold. The Greeks would have seen a telegraph pole both from the utilitarian and a poetic point of view, as a means of communication and as a living image of communication, as an upright wooden object with wires attached but also as a receptacle and transmitter of spirit. The modern man cannot see things that way: wonders crowd so thick and fast around him that he has almost lost the sense of wonder; and if he has a feeling for the spirit or essence of things, it is held incommunicado from his sense of their material utility. Reason and instinct are kept apart.

The Hebrews, one might add, would have seen a telegraph pole as an image of divine communication for the transmission of God's voice into all lands and his words into the end of the world. But these passages are so full of parallels at every point to the problem of leading men in worship in an age which has little or no sense of worship, that they may be left to speak for themselves. Suffice it to say that the corporate nature of worship makes the problem of the general imagination even more important than for the poet. We cannot ignore it, and simply revel in our own imaginative creations, however good, but nor may we sit back and wait for a suitably religious outlook on the world to develop of its own accord.

The task, then, of employing the thought forms and imagery of our contemporary age in worship is one of the utmost difficulty. But the difficulty does not justify our continuing to dwell solely in the cast-off shells of our predecessors. How then can it be done? My aim now is to put forward a few very tentative illustrations, in the hope that it may provoke those more competent to do the job much better.

For historical reasons the cross must always remain the central image of Christian faith. But that should not blind us to the fact that in an age where the Victoria Cross is the highest honour bestowed by the State, its associations (for those inside as well as those outside the Church) are very different from those of the first century. Is there not then a place in prayer or hymn, when the primary stress is on the shame our Saviour bore for us, for the replacement of the cross by the gallows or the electric chair? "Almighty God, whose beloved Son, for our sake, willingly offered himself to endure the agony of the condemned cell and the shame of hanging, remove from us all coldness and cowardice of heart, and give us courage to follow him in the way of the gallows, through the same Jesus Christ, our Lord." Does it offend and if so why? Is it the stark crudity and ugliness of it? And if it is, is not that another indication of the importance of the task we are attempting?

"God in a workman's jacket as before", says Studdert Kennedy in one of his hymns, and that says something to us that "the carpenter of Nazareth" cannot say. Is it perhaps the anachronism, the playing fast and loose with history, that offends? That is a better reason, but is it an adequate one? We dare not say that if God had become incarnate at this time he could not or would not have become incarnate as a manual worker in heavy industry. Is it not possible for the letter of historical propriety to obscure the spirit of theological relevance?

However historical Ananias, Azarias, and Misael may be, can the last verse of the *Benedicite* be other than an anticlimax? Would not the substitution of modern confessors light up the whole hymn? "O Berggrav, Niemöller, and Mindszenty, bless ye the Lord, praise him and magnify him for ever."

We speak and sing of God as our shield and even as our buckler. Ought we not to be prepared to use contemporary equivalents? "O God, our deep air raid shelter, grant us protection from the blast and splinters of temptation, and keep our trust in thee secure from the direct hit of utter despair through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Missionaries working among Eskimos have changed sheep into seals. Is there not also a case for another transmutation of the image in industrial sections of society? "I am the good shop-steward. My men listen to my voice. They will not follow the agitator into unofficial strikes or violent action, because they are devoted to my cause and I to them."

But enough of these fantasies. They are but the first faltering steps of such a way of worship. The important thing is that we should see that it is not only a legitimate but a needful way of worship. "We must grasp the fact that worship cannot take place in an ecclesiastical Avalon, but to a large extent reflects the ever-changing needs and ideas of the worshippers."[1] The relation between theology and worship is a two-way traffic. The practice of the parabolic method as a theological discipline will lead us to a worship which more truly interprets and sanctifies our modern life. And such worship in its turn will enable us to perform more faithfully a theological discipline which might otherwise be beyond our powers.

MAURICE WILES.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Bailey is the Lecturer of the Church of England Moral Welfare Council.

Miss Thrall is Classics Mistress at St Alban's High School.

Mr Paton, who was formerly in the Foreign Service, is now a candidate for ordination at Lincoln Theological College.

The Rev. M. F. Wiles is the Chaplain of Ridley Hall, Cambridge.

---

[1] Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 741.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE DATE OF THE LAST SUPPER

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I submit that Mr Paul has not produced an incontrovertible argument in support of the Markan dating of the Last Supper. As he admits, St Mark actually does no more than imply that our Lord returned to Bethany each night after the Triumphal Entry. St Luke, however, asserts definitely that "every day he was teaching in the temple; and every night he went out, and lodged in the mount that is called the mount of Olives" (Luke 21. 37). It is true that Creed takes this verse as a mere editorial insertion, but Knox (*The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*, Vol I, p. 84) observes that in that case it is peculiarly pointless. He suggests that since it explains what Judas could in fact betray, it may well come from one of the sources drawn on by St Mark and St Luke. If this were so, it might have a good claim to be an authentic reminiscence, and we should be unable to rely on arguments based on Bethany.

Yours faithfully,

THE UNIVERSITY,
MANCHESTER.

H. J. M. TURNER.

THE CHURCH OF SOUTH INDIA

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

In the Editorial to your July issue, which is given over to the subject of the Church of South India, you state that the articles published about this "are intended to be informative rather than argumentative". It is however inevitable that articles by those who have felt able to continue in the C.S.I. should show a bias in favour of the principles of the South India Scheme.

Being on the eve of leaving this country for some weeks, I cannot take up many points which call for comment, but I feel it important to protest against the suggestion that it is the duty of the Church of England "to make up its mind in 1955 about whether it ought or ought not to be in full communion with the Church of South India". This suggestion reappears, in the form of a plea that such full communion should be established, in the article of the Rev. D. Chellappa, and indeed is found in the book *The Historic Episcopate* which you review. On the other hand, the Rev. W. Elphick plainly states that such full communion is not possible at the present time (p. 262), and also (pp. 260–1) that there are exceptions to full communion within the C.S.I. itself.

The C.S.I. is, on any showing, in a transitional state, and it is not reasonable that the Church of England should be precluded from taking that situation into account.

May I also submit that the suggestion implied in the quotation from Professor Whitehorn that any body of Christians should take episcopacy into their systems "for the sole purpose of establishing intercommunion" is misconceived, and the source of much difficulty. The C.S.I. itself would surely, as the articles you print show, see more in episcopacy than that.

Yours faithfully,
HAROLD RILEY.

THE CHURCH UNION,
6, HYDE PARK GATE,
LONDON, S.W.7.
12 *July* 1954.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Having been a member of the Bangalore Brotherhood of St Peter (1945–53), I can heartily endorse the remarks of your four C.S.I. contributors in the July THEOLOGY, especially J. R. Chandran's "A Church on the Move", which is truly indicative of the widening outlook characteristic of so many thoughtful men in the non-Anglican traditions of the C.S.I.

In your editorial you say: "If the C. of E. cannot make up its mind in 1955 about whether it ought or ought not to be in full communion with the C.S.I., it will be hopelessly discredited in the field of church relations." Owing to the comparative ignorance in England of the spirit of the C.S.I., could not our Convocations trust the judgment of the C.I.P.B.C. and advance to the state of partial intercommunion which already exists between the C.I.P.B.C. and the C.S.I.; a state which is fuller than the present C. of E.–C.S.I. intercommunion but is not, as yet, total? Should not the C. of E. in this matter keep pace not slower nor faster than the C.I.P.B.C., which, after all, is the Anglican Province most intimately concerned and most conveniently situated to know the facts?

In view of Canon Elphick's frank statement, I wish you had written: If the "right wing" of the C. of E. continues not to recruit men for the C.S.I., it will have forfeited its opportunity to witness to the grandeur of catholicism at a time and place where its witness would be the most fruitful.

Yours faithfully,
P. J. HAND.

ST BARNABAS VICARAGE,
SOUTHFIELDS,
LONDON, S.W.18.
13 *July* 1954.

BOOK REVIEWS

AUTHORITY AND FREEDOM. Hulsean Lectures. By Robert H. Thouless. Hodder and Stoughton. 8s. 6d.

Dr Thouless states in the preface to his book that he is concerned with three main problems: first, is there now a decline in religious

conviction? secondly, is it possible for a reasonable modern man to accept a religious system of thought? and thirdly, are there respects in which religious ideas are presented to the modern man which unnecessarily increase his difficulty of acceptance? To each of these questions he gives the answer Yes. The summary is slightly misleading, since the first two questions are dealt with very briefly, and it is the third with which the book is mainly concerned.

On the first question, the decline in religious conviction, it may well prove that the answer was already becoming out of date when it was written; and Dr Thouless himself notices the heightened interest in religion in Cambridge as compared with the years before 1939. His answer to the third question may also seem to some readers a little out of date, since he is pleading for greater liberty of inquiry, in a day when in religion and other fields most people are asking for a greater assertion of authority.

Even in days such as these it might ease the conscience of many clergy and laity, and explain what is in fact the actual position, if one suggestion in his book were adopted, namely explicit mention in the Book of Common Prayer of the "general assent" to the Articles permitted since 1865. He has a case, which at least deserves consideration, when he asks that orthodox and obligatory beliefs should be distinguished from orthodox non-essential beliefs, in the sense that the latter would be acknowledged as part of the inherited Christian tradition, but that a believer might be a loyal member of the Church, while reserving with regard to them a mind free for further inquiry. When he considers placing amongst such "orthodox non-essential beliefs" the phrase "of one substance with the Father", readers may perhaps feel that he becomes open to his own self-criticism, that "there are obvious disadvantages in one who is not a theologian venturing to discuss theological topics".

The chapter in the book on Religious Language is of particular interest, for those who are following the current controversy over "demythologizing". On this Dr Thouless quotes the relevant saying from *The Cloud of Unknowing*, "Be aware that thou conceive not bodily that which is meant ghostly, although it be spoken in bodily words, as be these, up or down, in or out, behind or before." He suggests that it is we who have read back a literal interpretation into earlier mythical language, and who then react against what we ourselves have imposed; "the confusion between metaphor and literal statement is not a characteristic of early Christian thought, but rather of modern times".

While Dr Thouless's plea for freedom of inquiry may seem to some a little out of date amid the present quest for authoritative teaching, nevertheless amid this present temper his plea may in fact prove all the more timely and urgent. In days such as these we need the warning, which Dr Thouless gives with his psychological approach, that a glib assent to authority may remain superficial, and that a deeper and stronger faith can be won only through doubt and inquiry. "Freedom to explore other fields may be the way to attain fuller understanding of the approved paths. It is true that one who

is free to wander may never come back to the true paths; that is a risk that must be taken by the religious explorer. The price of freedom is that one also has freedom to make mistakes; the price of intellectual bondage is that assent remains at a superficial level." These are wise words, which represent the main theme of the book; and they are words which we do well to hear and heed, as we seek a true balance of authority and freedom in religion.

Ripon Hall,
Oxford.

Geoffrey Allen, Bishop.

A Commentary on I Maccabees. By J. C. Dancy. Basil Blackwell. 18s.

An Introduction to the Old Testament. By E. J. Young. Tyndale Press. 18s. 6d.

While hoping that it will be of use to professional scholars, Mr Dancy has written his commentary on I Maccabees primarily for first-year students of theology at Oxford. About a quarter of the book is devoted to a literary and historical introduction, and most of the rest to a commentary on the English text. Mr Dancy's opinion of the statesmanship of Antiochus Epiphanes is somewhat higher than that held by some scholars. He argues that the aim of the persecution of the Jews was to curb nationalism and political turbulence by abolishing the religious exclusiveness which underlay them. Antiochus sought to conform Judaism not so much to Hellenistic as to oriental religious cults.

This book is most useful and generally reliable. There are, however, minor points which are open to criticism—especially in the sphere of Semitic studies. It is, for example, misleading to say (p. 86) that the Jews massacred on the Sabbath would have profaned the day merely by leaving their caves. On p. 78 he speaks of the substitution of Mephiboseth for Mephiba'al without mentioning the form Meriba'al actually found in the Old Testament. To say that "karnain" means "horn" in Hebrew (p. 107) is to confuse Hebrew with Aramaic and the singular with the dual.

A more serious defect is that Mr Dancy, like many scholars, writes without due caution on the development of Jewish parties. The Hasidaeans are mentioned by name only twice in 1 Maccabees and once in 2 Maccabees. It is by no means obvious that it was Hasidaeans who refused to fight on the Sabbath, that they are referred to in Daniel 11. 33, that they later became the Pharisees, or that they were normally "simple people, less well educated than the Scribes" (pp. 27, 86, 122).

Even more misleading for the first-year undergraduate is the discussion of the Zadokite writings found in the Cairo Genizah and at Qumran. Mr Dancy does little more than present Professor Rowley's theory of the historical background with only a slight caution. The junior undergraduate is unlikely to realize—what Dr Rowley would be the first to admit—that this view is but one among many and that many scholars would emphatically reject it.

Apart from an outline history of Old Testament introduction and a statement of his views on inspiration and the Canon, Dr Young's book is concerned not with the Old Testament as a whole but with its individual books. He believes that our Lord's use of the Old Testament guarantees its inerrancy and verbal inspiration. Other views are rejected even though Dr Young seeks to discuss them fairly and as fully as space permits. It is rather irritating to find such terms as "negative" and "destructive criticism" frequently used of positions held by most modern Christian scholars. Nor is it fair to describe the "History of Tradition" school as "basically a form of scepticism" (p. 197).

In opposing other views than his own he scores a number of points, but his arguments are frequently forced. He fails, for example, to offer a convincing explanation (p. 179) why Saul does not know David's father in 1 Sam. 17. Sometimes he fails adequately to present other opinions such as that which sees stylistic reasons against holding that Isaiah is a unity (p. 206). If space is short it would have been better not to devote over forty pages to a history of Pentateuchal criticism but to discuss more fully the problems which give rise to a diversity of opinion.

Despite his refusal to admit the legitimacy of pseudonymity in ancient literature—a view which (p. 31) causes him to do less than justice to Professor Pfeiffer—he apparently regards Ecclesiastes as pseudonymous. It is also strange that a scholar who treats New Testament statements as determinative should refuse to follow Matt. 27. 9 f. in attributing Zech. 11. 12 f. to Jeremiah.

Dr Young's book is not a great contribution to Old Testament studies. But for all its failings it does provide a well-written and readable presentation of the ultra-conservative position by a learned and able scholar.

J. A. Emerton.

School of Oriental Studies,
University of Durham.

Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics. An introductory report by Otto Weber. Lutterworth Press. 16s.

Against the Stream. By Karl Barth. S.C.M. Press. 16s.

To attempt to evaluate or to criticize the theology of Karl Barth seems an almost hopeless task. Any judgment on a particular statement of his or on a particular section of his system is likely to prompt the rejoinder: "But have you read the full statement of that point in the Church Dogmatics?" And if the answer is "No", then there seems no way of progressing any further. "I certainly do not require anyone to speak well or ill of me," Barth writes, "nor do I really insist that a man must read me at all. But if anyone wishes to speak about me, he should at least have read me. . . . Moreover (if he is a serious person and not a journalist, and therefore not a theologian who thumbs through a book) he should have read me

completely." And the Church Dogmatics already stands at 5,956 pages in the German edition!

In the light of this formidable requirement one can only assume that the reading of Otto Weber's volume is to be regarded as a preliminary canter before undertaking the real journey. The publishers indeed describe it as the "Baedeker through Barth". I wish I could report that the outline map had filled me with a consuming desire to traverse the vast continent of the Church Dogmatics at all costs. Instead I fear that it has had precisely the opposite effect. Only in two or three places does the summary spring to life for me and awaken real interest. In the main it is a faithful and painstaking condensation of the general argument with a generous sprinkling of actual quotations from the text itself. Certainly it gives a good idea of the way in which the successive themes are treated and a clear indication of the places in the original where particular doctrines are to be found. But when 250 pages have to do service for 6,000 the compression is bound to be severe. In parts, indeed, the narrative is scarcely intelligible unless one is trained in the idiom of the original.

It is estimated that Barth has completed roughly one-half of his vast enterprise. The volumes covered by Weber's summary may be said to deal with the doctrines of God and of Man, though in a highly distinctive way. Sections on "The Triune God" precede the full treatment of God's Reality, his Gracious Election and his Work of Creation: the section on Man is followed by a long treatment of Freedom in its various relations. One of the best things in the book is Barth's own foreword, which is full of humour and liveliness. But I salute with great admiration the devoted labours both of Otto Weber, the German creator of the outline, and of Arthur Cochrane, the Canadian translator, who is now teaching in the U.S.A.

Against the Stream is a collection of some of Barth's post-war writings with a delightful portrait of the author as frontispiece. The main theme is that of the responsibility of the Christian community in the midst of political change. A large section is devoted to a Hungarian journey made by Barth in 1948, there is an article on the problem of the situation of the Church between East and West published in 1949, and there is an extended treatment of the Christian Doctrine of Revelation based on a course of lectures given in 1947. To me one of the finest things in the book is a paper on "The Christian Message and the New Humanism" read to a gathering of intellectuals representing many points of view. When Barth speaks directly to a particular problem or reports on some existing situation he is always impressive. But so often he speaks in what appear to be abstractions or negations and one is left wondering what the positive meaning of all that is said really amounts to.

In a spirited introduction Mr Gregor Smith, the Editor of the collection, defends Barth against the charge of producing a theology which is theoretical and incapable of being applied to concrete situations. He claims that this theology, far from being "like his own Swiss Alps, grand, impressive—but cold—and in their highest reaches at least—uninhabitable", is rather capable of "being transformed

into the most apt power, whether that power is expressed in prophetic or pastoral or political form". It may be so. Certainly his words are eagerly welcomed in many parts of the world. Even those who differ from him have learned much from him. But whether his Dogmatics will ultimately commend itself to the Church as definitive *Church* Dogmatics is another question.

LIVERPOOL. F. W. DILLISTONE.

BAPTISM AND THE ANGLICAN REFORMERS. By G. W. Bromiley. Lutterworth Press. 21s.

The controversies of the Reformation, particularly in England, were so much concerned with the question of the Mass that we are apt to forget that there were other matters of theology in which the Reformers were deeply interested. Not least among these was baptism, which was all the more important by reason of its connexion with the great topic of justification; yet, strangely enough, no full and authoritative account has been given of the teaching of the sixteenth-century Anglican divines upon this subject. Now, however, Dr Bromiley has supplied this want with an admirably clear, accurate, and impartial study in which he sets out concisely, yet with ample quotation from the sources, the doctrine of the English Reformers upon the sacrament of baptism. He discusses the nature of the sacrament itself, its ministers and recipients, the structure and ceremonies of the baptismal office, and the effects and efficacy of the sacramental grace. His method is systematically to examine the teaching of the Lutherans, the Zwinglians, and the Reformed, and then to show to what extent the Anglicans were indebted to the Continental thinkers, and what modifications and developments distinguished their own theology. The result is a book which no one concerned with either the theology of Christian initiation or with the pastoral problems connected with the administration of baptism can afford to ignore.

Perhaps one of the most interesting and relevant topics discussed is that of the "general necessity" of baptism. The framers of the Edwardine Prayer Book taught that this necessity was one of precept, and was not absolute, and a study of their arguments might clarify some of the problems which agitate those who are concerned about indiscriminate baptism to-day. There is much else that is valuable in Dr Bromiley's book, including an enlightening assessment of the position of the Anabaptists, and an interesting account of the points at issue between the Anglicans and the Puritans—though sometimes he is perhaps too sanguine that their differences could have been composed with more goodwill on both sides. Among the authorities cited it is particularly gratifying to see the place of prominence occupied by Becon, whose writings have been unduly neglected in the past.

By contrast with the precise documentation from Reformation sources, the patristic references are sketchy; only Bingham (and not the latest edition) is cited—and a note (p. 78) seems to attribute to

the *Antiquities* a summary of scholastic opinion. One departure from common usage ("Thomas" for "Aquinas") appears a little incongruous, particularly when "Aquinas" occurs in the list of abbreviations, and Lombard is used where one might have expected Peter! And there is a somewhat perplexing allusion to Ridley in connexion with the Frankfort controversies (p. 61; n. 2 seems to need correction). Altogether, however, Dr Bromiley has written an interesting and important book, which deserves careful study; the Reformers have not always been given their due, and he shows that in the matter of baptism at least we cannot afford to neglect them. Perhaps he will now increase our debt to him by expounding their teaching on Confirmation?

SHERWIN BAILEY.

BIRMINGHAM.

THE CONCEPTION OF THE INNER LIGHT IN ROBERT BARCLAY'S THEOLOGY. By Leif Eeg-Olofsson. C. W. K. Gleerup, Lund. 27s. 6d.

Few doctrines stand more in need of careful analysis and sympathetic valuation than the Quaker doctrine of the Inner Light, which is to-day often presented as the vague belief in something of God in every man. Dr Eeg-Olofsson has chosen the treatment of the theme in Robert Barclay's theology for such an analysis and valuation. He has given us a careful, scholarly and exhaustive analysis of the conception of the Inner Light in Barclay, compared and contrasted with the understanding of "Sola-Gratia" mysticism in present-day Swedish Lutheran theology. While this study is of special interest to Friends, it has a wider appeal as representative of a school of theology to which we are increasingly in debt.

The book is well planned and written in a clear and readable style, though the proof-reading, especially in Greek quotations, is often at fault, and on occasion the English translator nods. A survey of conceptions of the inner light in Barclay's predecessors, and a discussion of the nature of the right knowledge of God, lead up to a review of Barclay's account of the inner light in general. Then follow chapters dealing with the relation of the inner light, so understood, to justification and perfection, to the Scriptures, to the Church and the Ministry, to worship and the Sacraments, and to ethical practice. The positions defended by Barclay are fairly and objectively stated and the critical comment is illuminating and often acute.

The main difficulties in Quaker theology turn on the relation of the universal, saving, inner light, to the historic revelation in Jesus Christ. The early Friends, including Barclay, found it hard to explain the connexion between the discovery of Christ as their inward teacher and the knowledge of Christ conveyed to them by the Scriptures. Barclay is open to the criticism that "he confuses two things: an inner, immediate revelation and an experienced, inner, spiritual apprehension of a historic revelation". The second was what George Fox was really after, but interpreting it in terms of an inner im-

mediate revelation which was held to be universal, Fox and Barclay both appear to regard the Scriptures and the historic revelation as the confirmation rather than the source of their experience of Christ within. They under-estimated their dependence on the Christ of the Gospels. Admittedly, where the early Quaker concern with Christ as our inward teacher is obscured, the doctrine of the inner light becomes an intellectualistic-moralistic mysticism.

The "Sola-Gratia" mysticism with which Dr Eeg-Olofsson contrasts Barclay's theology is itself open to criticism, and might find some needed corrective in Barclay. Barclay's interpretations of Scripture-passages, e.g. Romans 5. 12, are sometimes better than those of his Lutheran critics. But the weakness of "Sola-Gratia" mysticism lies deeper than the dubious interpretation of particular texts. It lies in the misconception of "grace". By "grace alone" the Lutherans understand that salvation is God's work alone. "In salvation there is only one subject, God, and one object, Man, and a co-operation between grace and the human will is excluded" (p. 84). But it is the nature of grace that God treats man as a subject and not as an object. "Son of man, stand upon thy feet and I will speak with thee." That is the language of grace. Apparently the Swedish-Lutheran understanding of "Sola-Gratia" mysticism is still bogged down in the Augustinian-Pelagian controversy. But Oman's *Grace and Personality*, to say nothing of Martin Buber's *Ich und Du*, takes us beyond that now barren controversy. Grace is essentially a personal relation between God and ourselves, which we owe to God alone, but so far from excluding the co-operation of the human will, grace invites it and makes it possible.

H. G. Wood.

Birmingham.

Joshua Watson, The Story of a Layman, 1771–1855. By A. B. Webster. S.P.C.K. 15s.

Amidst the spate of ecclesiastical biographies which centre upon clerical and often episcopal figures, it is refreshing to read a book about a layman. For the devout layman is (as Canon Charles Smyth once reminded us) one of the distinct glories of the English Church since the Reformation.[1] And the Vicar of Barnard Castle has given us a biography of one who was not only devout but one who laid the foundation stones of much of modern church organization. Joshua Watson, a prosperous London wine-merchant, retired from the family business at the age of forty-three to become a full-time church worker, a committee-man *par excellence* closely associated with the National Society, the Additional Curates Society, the Incorporated Church Building Society as well as S.P.C.K. and S.P.G. Yet, as Mr Webster shows us, he was no mere bureaucrat—he was the brains as well as the pen behind the early development of religious education, the growth of churches in the new towns, much

[1] *The Genius of the Church of England*, p. 28.

of the work of the pioneering missionary bishops and the early stages of the Oxford Movement.

It is rather strange that this is the first modern biography of such a great Christian layman and the only one since Edward Churton's Memoir of 1861. Mr Webster has brought new material to light and revived interest in a figure who has been too long forgotten. For this we should be very grateful. But it is not unnatural in a work which breaks new ground that the ground is broken somewhat unevenly. If there is a weakness in this book it seems to be that it falls between two stools. On the one hand it is not an academic study such as one might wish for when so little has been written about Joshua Watson. On the other hand (in spite of the lively narrative of the first chapter), it is not "popular" history of the kind in which writers like Mrs Woodham Smith excel. One result of this is that Watson hardly becomes a real person until the last chapter and one might wish that some of the personal material (which comes, we are told, from Churton) had been introduced earlier in the book.

One might wish, too, for more assessments of Watson's influence in the various spheres of his activity. In point of fact, there are few critical judgments and one would be grateful for more from an author who has made a special study of this character. Also, it is hard to see why secondary sources are sometimes used instead of primary ones. (Why, for instance, is such a standard authority as Arthur Young quoted via Trevelyan in the footnote on p. 12?) And, surely, one does not have to be a die-hard Evangelical to protest against the bald description of the Oxford Movement as "the greatest religious revival of the century" (p. 112)?

But these are relatively small matters. *Joshua Watson* should be read by all those who want a better understanding of the Church of England in the first half of the nineteenth century. And if Mr Webster is at times carried away by his enthusiasm for his subject, it is infectious enthusiasm which should inspire us to a greater interest in this somewhat neglected layman. In days when the clergy—and the laity—are becoming overburdened by the committee work of the church, we have before us the example of Joshua Watson to show us that reports, statements and minutes and indeed all the business of church committees can be turned to the glory of God.

Desborough Vicarage.
Nr Kettering.

Michael Webster.

SHORTER NOTICES

Man, God and Prayer. By H. Northcott, C.R. S.P.C.K. 9s. 6d.

The Altar Fire. By Olive Wyon. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

My God My Glory. By E. Milner-White. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

On the subject of prayer it is virtually impossible to say anything new. Yet every year more books appear dealing with it. Their writers might plead as the shopman did in reply to the complaint that none

of his Christmas toys were new, "No, but the children are." It is a hopeful sign that there are readers with unjaded appetites like children, eager for light on this vital topic. What is important is that the new books should be written in the idiom of contemporary thought; and for the present generation that means something not too ponderous or abstract, but picturesque and arresting. By this the three books before us must be judged.

The first is by Father Northcott, C.R., who three or four years ago had a great success with his *Venture of Prayer*. His present work *God, Man, and Prayer* (a curious sequence of words) is a compendium of his larger work, with a good deal of additional matter. Perhaps he had in mind the remark of the famous Dean to the unctuous preacher who announced in the vestry that he would give the cathedral congregation "the pure milk of the Word", "I pray, Sir, that it may be condensed milk". But condensed milk may be too cloying for the palate and sticky for the gums. Father Northcott's book is really a textbook for use on the mission field and beginners in the spiritual life; and those who accept it as that will not expect to find in it more than it is meant to contain. Its aim is instruction rather than inspiration; and the instruction is sound and lucid. Those who feel that the earlier part is too elementary for their stage of development will probably find something more suited to their need in the chapters on Mental and Contemplative Prayer towards the end of the book.

The second book is also in a sense a repeat performance by Dr Olive Wyon after the success of her *School of Prayer*. For her new one she adopts a title previously used by A. C. Benson, *The Altar Fire*, but the contents are widely different. His was a self-centred soliloquy; hers is an adoring commentary on the centre of the Church's worship—the supreme Sacrament. She divides her treatment of it according to Evelyn Underhill's classification; and under each head brings out some fresh aspect of the "variegated grace of God". Members of any branch of the Christian Church can scarcely fail to find in these pages admirable material for their self-examination and preparation for Communion, and the value of it is increased by the extracts from the ancient liturgies at the beginning and end of each chapter.

The first two books speak about prayer; the third, *My God My Glory*, by the Dean of York, consists of Prayers; and to many people already versed in the art of prayer it will be the most attractive of the three. (To others, for less cogent reasons, it will be attractive because of its "get-up". Father Northcott's looks like a school lesson-book; Dr Wyon's with its red-and-gold binding is daintier; but the third, with its delicately coloured cover, ample margins, uncramped spacing, and pleasant print, makes it worthier of its theme.) The Dean uses the method of Bishop Andrewes in the seventeenth century, and of Archbishop Goodier and Father Roche in our own, which sets the prayers in short lines of unequal length, each containing only one phrase or idea, so that the mind can ponder and savour the meaning of each. The Dean has outlived the "preciousness" which sometimes spoilt his earlier efforts. Here there is a sense of unfeigned longing

and devotion; and the restraint which disciplines its ardour makes it the more effective in rousing one's own.

LUMSDEN BARKWAY, BP.

KINGSCOTE,
TETBURY.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST JOHN. By R. A. Edwards. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 12s. 6d.

Canon Edwards in this book attempts to break new ground in the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. He rejects the idea that the Fourth Evangelist was trying to build a bridge which would enable converts from paganism to pass over easily into the Christian Church. The Fourth Gospel is rather a restatement of the original apostolic preaching of Jesus the Messiah. His purpose in writing, argues Canon Edwards, was to urge the young Church to turn away from Greek speculation to the Hebrew origins of the Christian faith. His book was a protest against a "modernizing" movement within the Church and a warning that the pagan converts must turn to the Jewish religion in order to learn how the divine revelation had culminated in Jesus the Messiah.

If this was the main purpose of the Fourth Evangelist it is difficult to understand why, among other things, he should deliberately open his Gospel with a reference to the Logos which would immediately recall to the minds of the converts an idea prominent in their pre-Christian religious thought rather than to ideas about the Jewish Messiah. Canon Edwards, however, claims that this Messianic approach to the Fourth Gospel resolves many of the difficulties which perplex scholars who see in the book a different and more complex purpose. And there is no doubt that Canon Edwards has written an interesting book which should have an honourable place in the ever growing *corpus* of Johannine literature.

E. KENNETH LEE.

HORSFORTH.

ADVOCATES OF REFORM FROM WYCLIF TO ERASMUS. Edited by Matthew Spinka.

CHRISTOLOGY OF THE LATER FATHERS. Edited by E. R. Hardy and C. C. Richardson.

CALVIN: THEOLOGICAL TREATISES. Edited by J. K. S. Reid.

The Library of Christian Classics. S.C.M. Press. 30s. each.

We have to report the publication of three more volumes in the altogether excellent Library of Christian Classics. *Advocates of Reform* covers the period from the second half of the fourteenth century to the beginning of the sixteenth century. It contains essays by Dr Spinka on "John Wyclif, Advocate of Radical Reform", "Conciliarism as Ecclesiastical Reform", "John Hus, Advocate of Spiritual

Reform", and "Desiderius Erasmus, a Humanistic Reformer", each essay being followed by representative texts in translation.

Christology of the Later Fathers contains the most important Christological writings of Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa; these are followed by a series of documents illustrating the Christology of the Ecumenical Councils, from the Council of Nicaea to the Third Council of Constantinople. This is a volume that will be invaluable to the student of early Christian doctrine.

Calvin: Theological Treatises contains a collection of Calvin's lesser and, for the most part, less well-known writings. The *Institutes* are to appear later in the Library of Christian Classics in two volumes; there will also be a volume containing a selection from the Commentaries and Letters. The present volume is in three parts which illustrate Calvin's work as a positive theologian, as an apologist, and as a controversialist. Perhaps, more than the volumes that are to follow, this one will be found to present what the editor calls "the astounding versatility of Calvin".

Edward Keble Talbot: his community and his friends. Compiled by G. P. H. Pawson, C.R. S.P.C.K. 17s. 6d.

N. P. Williams. By E. W. Kemp. S.P.C.K. 21s.

Philip Loyd: missionary and bishop. By R. P. Stacy Waddy. Mowbray. 10s. 6d.

The first two of these books contain not only memoirs but some representative writings of Father Talbot and Professor Williams. In the case of Williams these are chiefly sermons: he was a master of lucid and eloquent exposition. Talbot was not so well known as an author, but his articles, essays and letters that are here collected are enchanting—the kind of thing that determines the reader to get hold of anything else he can by the same writer. The third book is a straightforward memoir, which will be welcomed by all who knew Bishop Loyd.

Christendom Attacked. A Comparison of Kierkegaard and Nietzsche. By Conrad Bonifazi. Rockliff. 21s.

The Experience of Death. The Moral Problem of Suicide. By Paul-Louis Landsberg. Translated by Cynthia Rowland. Foreword by Martin Jarrett-Kerr, C.R. Rockliff. 8s. 6d.

The kind of philosophizing and writing which may broadly be termed "existentialist" seems unlikely to become a strongly established force in this country. It is the philosophy of a situation; the situation of the Christian or the refugee under totalitarian tyranny, of the defeated Frenchman, and we have no first-hand "existential" knowledge of that situation. Nevertheless, we cannot ignore it, if only for the reason that so many Christian thinkers on the Conti-

nent turn to it as a means of communicating the relevance of the Gospel to man in the modern predicament. Conrad Bonifazi (he is a Swiss, now working as minister of a Congregational church in Malvern) attempts in this book a summary and comparison of the thought of two of the "fathers of existentialism", Kierkegaard and Nietzsche, regarding them both as relentless critics of "Christendom"—the religion of the protestant established churches of northern Europe, with what they saw as the conventional religiosity of bishops, clergy and lay-people, so accommodated to the world, so completely at loss in its thought and practice as to be entirely false to Christ and to New Testament Christianity. Mr Bonifazi does not attempt to do more than to allow Kierkegaard the radical Christian and Nietzsche the atheist to speak for themselves; in this book of under 200 pages there are nearly 700 quotations, almost entirely drawn from their writings. His account of Nietzsche's attack on Christian morality (ch. 7) and of Kierkegaard's view of the nature of faith (ch. 8) are particularly useful. In general, this book gives a carefully marshalled introduction, almost entirely in their own words, to the thought of these two strange and tormented spirits.

Paul-Louis Landsberg, a young German-Jewish philosopher who fled from Germany to escape from Nazism, lived the rest of his life, in Spain and France, under the ever more imminent threat of violent death and in the context of social disintegration and collapse. He was baptized as a child, and his intellectual development drew him to an acceptance of Catholic orthodoxy, though he never became a member of the Roman Church. These two essays (one deduces that they were written between 1936 and 1940) are autobiographical and "existential" in that they are written out of the bitter experience of a man of remarkable intellectual power and spiritual attractiveness, to whom the threat of violent death, and that in a form which tempted him to suicide, was an ever-present issue, and one, moreover, decisive in the elucidation of the nature of the self, the person, the question upon which his thought centres. He had decided to commit suicide, if arrested by the Gestapo, but when this in fact happened he destroyed the poison he carried and died in a concentration camp. The analysis in the first essay, on the experience of death, turns upon the point that full realization of one's own individuality, selfhood, comes in the experience of friendship or love; this relationship creates a "we" of two persons, a community of existence with another which is part of myself, and such that the experience of the death of a friend is the experience of my own death in the very core of my being. The essay on suicide is a discussion of the character of Christian morality in general as exemplified in this particular problem. His survey of arguments supporting the condemnation of suicide in traditional moral theology (based on a morality of natural law) leads him to reject them as insufficient; the complete Christian rejection of suicide can, he says, "only be justified or indeed understood in relation to the scandal and the paradox of the Cross" (p. 88); "there is an abyss between natural morality on the one hand and the supernatural morality of Christi-

anity on the other" (p. 92). Those who remain uneasy about the unquestioned assumption of a Thomist-Aristotelean natural law theory as the basis of the very welcome renewal of non-Roman moral theology will find this essay of great interest. Both in their central themes, and in the compressed and pregnant comments on relevant issues, these two essays bring the reader into touch with a mind and spirit of unusual distinction. Fr Jarrett-Kerr contributes a valuable introduction to Landsberg's life and thought.

Longden Rectory, Shrewsbury. R. A. Jones.

The Devil's Hunting-Grounds. By Harry Blamires. Longmans. 8s. 6d.

The most surprising thing about this book is that it does not contain a preface by C. S. Lewis; but the dust-cover is enriched by a message from no less an authority than the Devil. His hunting-grounds are purgatorial urban and rural districts peopled by heretics very like ourselves. "We intend", says the egregious Dr Primrose, "to submit our Report to the higher authorities in the Hierarchies, with a request that it be brought to God's notice. We are determined to help God. He needs our help. Let us admit that things are not going very well with his cause down below just at present. All the greater reason why we should come forward with our advice."

The popularity of the novel with the inverted moral should be well sustained by Mr Blamires' scholarly treatise on Things Beyond. Perhaps multiple irony has its limitations as a device for showing up the idiocy of much that passes for orthodoxy in high places. When the Guardian Angel delivers the author's message straight from the shoulder, it turns out not to be as profound as the infernal gymnastics had led us to expect. But doubtless this review is itself only a clipping from the *Paradise Post*.

Walter Roberts.

Nonsuch. By Sister Frances. Mowbray. 5s.

The Community of St Katharine is to be congratulated on the gathering together of these "Poems from a Novice's Attic", which recall the mood of Hopkins' nun taking the veil. The strength of conviction and musical dexterity of her "Litany for Lute" would have rejoiced the heart of George Herbert, and the best of her lyrics bear witness to the vitality of the Rosetti tradition.

Walter Roberts.

Christ Recrucified. A Novel by Nikos Kazantzakis. Faber and Faber. 15s.

Yes, it is a novel; richly coloured, psychologically mature, and, like its Gospel archetype, a "shocking" story. Palestine here is a pros-

perous, isolated Greek community of the early 1920s, under their careless contemptuous Turkish Agha, of occasional savagery and consistent hedonism. The village "pope", fleshly and worldly Grigoris, exhorts the chosen for next Easter's Passion Play to "become what they are". Alas, when shepherd Manolios and his "disciples" imagine such putting on of Christ to imply help for a starving band of refugees, fellow-Greeks and Christians (who, repulsed by pope and "notables", have formed a pitiful settlement in the mountain caves)—then the cry is "Blasphemy!" and worse, "Bolshevik!" Inexorably, character and situation interdevelop. We move through landscapes vivid with blood, bestiality and self-sacrifice, zeal, lust and cunning, rapturous sensuality and rapt asceticism, to the climax of Sacrifice. What benefits of this Passion? If Mr Kazantzakis offers nothing explicit or dramatic, a Resurrection motif does recur throughout his sombre and sardonic score. His society's apprehension of the faith may be crude, bizarre, distorted, its paganism as virile as its Church is corrupt: "Your Christ has a full belly, and proclaims: 'This world is just, honest, soft-hearted, just right for me. Excommunicated be anyone who stirs a finger to disturb its order!'" Yet the positive vision is also realized. To convey the joy of sanctity and discipleship is a rare achievement. Inevitably, the atmosphere recalls Dostoevsky, and at times Tolstoy. Grigoris has a smack of the Grand Inquisitor. The normal touchstone is Simple Religion: Manolios and his comrades climb to the fresh mountain air, puzzle out the Beatitudes, and make mutual confession.

Almost sacramentally is the one Sacrifice re-presented. Not by forcing a complete parallelism of detail, by Hamlet-in-modern-dress technique. The device, the Anatolian Oberammergau, works rather by suggestive overtone and ironic echo. Our tale must always be much the same when Light and Darkness meet, but the author's effect is, strangely, to underline Calvary both in its historicity and its timelessness.

"Why doesn't he kill us to purify creation?" The answer: "God is a potter; he works in mud." Certainly, Mr Kazantzakis dabbles in it (let the squeamish be warned). He has it both ways. Manolios renounces world and flesh; others within the microcosmos must run the gamut of sensation and attitude. Few could not comply with that alleged rubric of the Eastern Church: "Here let the priest weep copiously." Unsophisticated, intense, word-drunk, self-dramatizing, they know how to express themselves.

COSELEY. D. W. FOSTER.

FLAMING MINISTER. By G. R. Elliott. Duke University Press. 34s.

Those who share the incredulity of the Rev. A. T. B. Byles at Dr Elliott's references to Othello in the December, 1953, issue of this journal can scarcely be expected to buy a whole book of his on the subject, but I hope they will persuade some of their friends that this book can be obtained through the Cambridge University Press, in some expectation that they may be able to borrow it, or at least hear what

it really is about. It is a close commentary on *Othello* scene by scene, supported by many references to the academic literature of the last twenty years, and occasionally enlivened by thrusts at Bradley, whose role in literary criticism is very much that of Harnack in the history of doctrine. This kind of book has a double relevance for theologians, first as a place where we may study parallels between changes in Shakesperean exegesis, and changes in Biblical interpretation. Both are due in part to a solid increase in detailed historical knowledge since Elizabethan literature, and source-criticism of the Scriptures, became objects of academic study. Both are also due to a change in the mood of the age. An attempt to disentangle these intermingling influences in a field other than his own would be a useful spiritual exercise for a Biblical critic acquainted with Shakespeare and Bradley. Secondly it is important to observe that while some professors of English have become Anglicans through an intensive study of Hooker, others remain under the impression, with which they began their researches, that Elizabethan religion was more pagan than Christian in its essential character. What makes them so much nearer to the Christian interpreters than to Bradley is their common appreciation of mythological modes of thought. In our understanding of literature and art, including the literature of the past, we are more disposed to-day to mythologize than to demythologize. Some at least are drawn to the first Elizabethan age as the last great age of poetry before the fatal question of truth was raised for our myth. Some would drown that question. The trouble is not that we cannot be mythological in the twentieth century, but that we cannot stop thinking mythologically, either about Macbeth or about St Mark.

KELHAM. GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

THE GENERAL THANKSGIVING. By John S. Higgins. Mowbray. 5s.

THE COMING OF THE LORD. By a Religious of C.S.M.V. Mowbray. 6s.

The former of these books has as its sub-title "Some Thoughts Today". That leads one to expect very much what one finds, thoughts lacking in profundity and authority, but good and devout and edifying, embellished with many anecdotes. The other book has profundity and an authority derived from a Scriptural basis. It, too, has a sub-title, "A Study in the Creed". It is very brief, only 79 pages long, written by one who is so steeped in the subject as to be able to write with vigour and unstiltedly. At first reading I was so much attracted by the felicities that I missed the theme. But that ensured that I read it again for the theme's sake. To summarize the book will not, I am afraid, convey much; but here is the author's own summary. "One Coming, in the Incarnation, in the Spirit, in the Sacraments, in the Judgment, and that a Coming to Heaven; and one Man who comes."

F. C. S.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ASSOCIATION FOR PROMOTING RETREATS: General List of Retreats (incorporating *The Vision*) (1s.).

A. AND C. BLACK: R. L. P. Milburn, *Early Christian Interpretations of History* (18s.); L. S. Thornton, *Confirmation: Its Place in the Baptismal Mystery* (15s.).

BLACKFRIARS PUBLICATIONS: Stephanus Axters, O.P., *The Spirituality of the Old Low Countries* (6s. 6d.).

BLACKWELL: Mario Untersteiner, *The Sophists* (31s. 6d.).

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY: John Stirling (Ed.), *The Bible: a new presentation of the Authorized Version* (7s. 6d.; Jubilee Edition, 15s.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS (for UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS): André-Jean Festugière, O.P., *Personal Religion among the Greeks* (28s.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS (for UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS): E. J. Goodspeed, *The Student's New Testament* (56s. 6d.).

CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY: Mary Clement, *The S.P.C.K. and Wales, 1699–1740* (25s.).

T. AND T. CLARK: Arthur H. Curtis, *The Vision and Mission of Jesus* (27s.).

JAMES CLARKE AND CO.: Norman L. Robinson, *How Jesus Christ Saves Men* (12s. 6d.).

CLONMORE AND REYNOLDS: Pierre Barbet, *The Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ* (16s.).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE (ST LOUIS): F. E. Mayer, *The Religious Bodies of America* (n.p.).

CUDDESDON COLLEGE: Owen Chadwick, *The Founding of Cuddesdon* (10s. and 7s. 6d.; post 6d. extra).

DESCLÉE ET CIE (TOURNAI): Paul Steven, *Eléments de Morale Sociale* (n.p.).

EDINBURGH HOUSE PRESS: L. B. Greaves, *The High Commission Territories* (1s.).

FABER AND FABER: E. Kadloubovsky and G. E. H. Palmer (Trans.), *Early Fathers from the Philokalia* (35s.).

GOLLANCZ: J. Langdon-Davies, *Sex, Sin and Sanctity* (16s.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Jack Winslow, *The Eyelids of the Dawn* (10s. 6d.).

LINDSEY PRESS: S. H. Mellone, *Leaders of Early Christian Thought* (15s.).

LONGMANS GREEN: Gerald W. Broomfield, *The Chosen People, or the Bible, Christianity and Race* (4s.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: R. Pilkington, *Revelation through Science* (10s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: Henry de Candole, *The Sacraments and the Church* [New edition] (5s.).

NISBET: H. H. Farmer, *Revelation and Religion* (7s. 6d.).

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: A. G. Willis and E. H. Hayes, *Yarns on Wessex Pioneers* (4s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Tom Allan, *The Face of My Parish* (7s. 6d.).

SHEED AND WARD: Père Bruno de Jesus-Marie, O.C.D. (Ed.), *Love and Violence* (18s.); F. R. Hoare (Ed.), *The Western Fathers* (18s.).

SOCIETY OF OLD TESTAMENT STUDY: *Book List 1954* (6s.).

S.P.C.K.: Donald A. Lowrie, *Saint Sergius in Paris* (15s.); Margaret G. Rhodes, *Bible Readings for Boys and Girls* (1s.); R. M. French (Trans.), *The Way of a Pilgrim* [a new edition of *The Way of a Pilgrim* and *The Pilgrim Continues his Way*] (10s. 6d.); H. P. Thompson, *Thomas Bray* (12s. 6d.).

ARTHUR H. STOCKWELL: S. B. Lindsay, *The Church of England and the Reformation* (2s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON